An Energy Consumption Model for IEEE 802.11ah WLANs

Albert Bel *Member, IEEE,* Toni Adame, and Boris Bellalta *Senior Member, IEEE*
Department of Information and Communication Technologies
Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona

arXiv:1512.03576v1 [cs.NI] 11 Dec 2015

***Abstract*—One of the main challenges when designing a new self-powered wireless sensor network (WSN) technology is the vast operational dependence on its scarce energy resources. Therefore, a thorough identification and characterisation of the main energy consumption processes may lay the foundation for developing further mechanisms aimed to make a more efficient use of devices' batteries. This paper provides an energy consumption model for IEEE 802.11ah WLANs operating in power saving mode, which are expected to become one of the technology drivers in the development of the Internet of Things (IoT) in the next years. Given the network characteristics, the presented analytical model is able to provide an estimation of the average energy consumed by a station as well as to predict its battery lifetime. Once the model has been validated, we use it to obtain the optimal IEEE 802.11ah power saving parameters in several IoT key scenarios, validating that the parameters provided by the IEEE 802.11ah Task Group are already a very good choice.**

***Index Terms*—IEEE 802.11ah, WLANs, M2M, WSNs, Power Saving Mechanisms.**

I. Introduction

The growing use of Machine to Machine (M2M) communications [1] envisages a future where personal and business decision making will be increasingly based on the information provided by these unattended systems. Their autonomous, scattered, ubiquitous and non-invasive nature facilitates the procedure of obtaining environmental data large amounts of sensors, but at the same time supposes a technological challenge, as most of their conforming devices are strongly conditioned by processing, memory and, particularly, energy constraints.

Indeed, neither of the two current IoT/M2M players (cellular networks and WSNs) has yet been able to produce a prevailing technology with such considerations, thus fostering the appearance of new low capability communication standards such as IEEE 802.11ah [2]. Conceived as an amendment of the consolidated and well-known IEEE 802.11 Wireless Local Area Network (WLAN) technology, this under-development amendment will offer a competitive long-range solution in the sub 1 GHz band for very large WSNs (i.e., $>$ 8K devices) with low power consumption and short-burst data transmission requirements ($<$ 100 Bytes) [3]. To achieve that, besides modifying the IEEE 802.11ac PHY layer to operate in the sub 1 GHz band, IEEE 802.11ah includes new power management mechanisms [4]. One of them, called *TIM and page segmentation* [5], extends the IEEE 802.11 power saving mechanism [6] and distributes network stations and channel resources according to a novel hierarchical method. Basically, energy consumption of a STA is reduced by limiting the number of possible contenders in its corresponding TDMA-like transmission period.

Manuscript received December 1, 2012; revised September 17, 2014. Corresponding author: A. Bel (email: albert.bel@upf.edu)

The analytical characterization of energy consumption in IEEE 802.11ah WLANs has been already considered by the research community. In [7], an analytical model to characterize the performance of the *TIM and page segmentation* scheme is proposed, although no calculations of energy consumption are included. On the contrary, [8] surveys the performance (collision probability, delay, and battery lifetime) of IEEE 802.11ah networks with periodic traffic while [9] predicts their saturation throughput and energy efficiency assuming known collision and error probabilities. As for IEEE 802.11ah simulations, a model to calculate the maximum number of stations using power saving mechanisms is presented in [10], a performance assessment of its power saving mechanism is included in [11], and a novel low-consuming channel access mechanism is proposed in [12].

This paper presents an analytical model for the energy consumption in an IEEE 802.11ah WLAN, where all elements of the *TIM and page segmentation* scheme (including signalling beacons, number of stations per group, transmission periods, and so forth) are taken into consideration to compute it. In addition, the model accuracy has been evaluated by comparing the model predictions with the results presented in [11], where the energy consumption of an IEEE 802.11ah WLAN in four typical M2M scenarios (agriculture monitoring, smart metering, industrial automation and animal monitoring) is evaluated by simulation. The obtained results reflect the similarity between the proposed model and the simulations, thus proving its effectiveness when predicting the energy consumption and the average lifetime of an IEEE 802.11ah WLAN. Moreover, once the model is validated, it has been used to optimize several IEEE 802.11ah parameters in terms of energy consumption and probability of successfully transmit a packet.

The remainder of this paper is organised as follows: Section II provide the main parameters and assumptions of the considered IEEE 802.11ah network while Section III details the equations of our analytical model. Its performance is evaluated in Section IV and the optimization of model variables is provided in Section V. Lastly, Section VI presents the conclusions and discusses open challenges.

II. System Model

A. IEEE 802.11ah WLAN Operation

IEEE 802.11ah extends the IEEE 802.11 power saving mechanism (PSM) [6] by using a scheme called *TIM and page segmentation*, which reduces the time a STA is competing for the channel and increases its sleeping periods.

IEEE 802.11ah introduces a novel hierarchical method to build groups of stations depending on an association identifier. This hierarchical distribution of stations into groups, called TIM groups, is used not only for organizational purposes but also for scheduling signalling and allocating available channel resources, allowing stations to enter in an sleep mode during non-traffic periods. Hence, a STA only wakes up at predefined moments to listen to the beacons, which are the following:

1) DTIM (Delivery Traffic Indication Map) beacons. They must be listened to by all STAs and inform about which TIM groups have pending data in the AP and also about multicast and broadcast messages.
2) TIM (Traffic Indication Map) beacons. Between two DTIM beacons, there are as many TIM beacons as TIM groups. Each TIM beacon informs a group of STAs about which specific ones have pending data in the AP.

After listening to DTIM beacons, transmitted every T seconds, a STA with pending data from the AP or pending data to transmit, will wake up to listen the corresponding TIM beacon, from where the STAs obtain information of the downlink and uplink RAW segments. Hence, a STA with packets to transmit or receive is only awake in its TIM period, remaining in sleeping mode otherwise.

In addition, the time between consecutive TIMs contains a restricted access window (RAW) formed by one downlink (DL) segment, one uplink (UL) segment, and one multicast (MC) segment placed immediately after each DTIM beacon. Distribution of beacons and RAW slots is shown in Figure 1. As we only consider the existence of TIM stations, the time between TIM beacons is only distributed between the RAW downlink and uplink periods.

In the present paper, where only STAs using the *TIM and page segmentation* scheme have been considered, the channel access combines an AP-centralized time period allocation system with the distributed coordination function (DCF) medium-access technique within those periods. The data transmission procedures for both the downlink and uplink cases are shown in Figure 1 and detailed as follows:

1) *Downlink*: When a STA has a data packet pending to receive, it will be informed first by the inclusion of its TIM group in the DTIM bitmap and later by its own inclusion in the TIM bitmap. To initiate the reception of its packet, the STA will send a PS-Poll frame in its assigned RAW downlink segment.
2) *Uplink*: Whenever a station wants to send an uplink message to the AP, it must first wait for its corresponding RAW uplink segment. Once within it, the STA will start the data transmission by using basic access or RTS/CTS mechanism.



Fig. 2. IEEE 802.11ah scenario considered in this paper.

B. Scenario

As shown in Figure 2, an IEEE 802.11ah WLAN that consists of N_{STA} STAs randomly distributed over a given area and a single AP placed at its center is considered. By applying STA sectorization, all nodes are able to detect transmissions from any other node in their TIM group, and therefore, collisions with hidden nodes are not considered. The number of sectors is the same as the number of TIM groups. In [13] and [14], the authors discuss about the hidden node problem in IEEE 802.11ah networks, and they provide possible solutions to avoid this problem, e.g., the sectorization of the STAs through the TIM groups or the use of information from an AP to spread out uplink transmissions over a period of time, thus eliminating the effects of hidden nodes.

1) Channel model: STAs and the AP communicate at rate $R_{dB}(d)$, which depends on the distance between both devices and the environment's path loss. To compute the value of $R_{dB}(d)$ we follow the approach presented in [15] for both indoor and outdoor scenarios:[1]

$$R_{dB}(d) = P_{\text{TX}} + G_{\text{TX}} - \text{PL}(d) - \text{FM}(d) + G_{\text{RX}} - \left(\frac{E_b}{N_0}\right)_{dB} - N_0 \quad (1)$$

where P_{TX} is the transmission power, G_{TX} and G_{RX} are the antenna gains at the transmitter and receiver, respectively, $\text{PL}(d)$ is the path loss, $\text{FM}(d)$ is the fade margin, and $\left(\frac{E_b}{N_0}\right)_{dB}$ value depends on the modulation and coding rate used. The different existing modulations and coding rates, as well as the rest of parameters used in this paper to compute the path loss, are shown in Table I.

Transmitted packets can suffer from transmission errors with probability p_e. The value of p_e is assumed to be constant regardless the distance between the STA and the AP. This assumption is justified by the use of multiple transmission rates. We consider that the modulation and coding rate are adapted to compensate for the change in signal-to-noise ratio with the goal of keeping p_e constant. Moreover, it is only applied to DATA packets in both downlink and uplink. Other packets are therefore considered error-free.

[1]For further details, we refer the reader to [15], where the calculation of $R_{dB}(d)$ is explained in detail.



Fig. 1. Beacon signalling of the AP and transmission procedures of TIM STAs in IEEE 802.11ah WLANs

Parameter	Description	Value			
f	Carrier frequency	900 MHz			
d_{BP}	Breakpoint distance	5 m			
P_{TX}	Transmission power	0 dBm			
G_{TX}	Transmission gain	0 dBi			
G_{RX}	Reception gain	3 dBi			
T_0	Receiver temperature	293 K			
N_0	Noise figure	3 dB			
B	Bandwidth	1 MHz			
L	Data packet size	100 bytes			
PER	Packet error rate	10%			
FM	Fade margin	Outdoor 12.82 dB Indoor 3.84 dB			
Mod	Modulation	mode	modulation	code rate	data rate (R)
		MCS 0	BPSK	1/2	300 kbps
		MCS 1-2	QPSK	1/2	600 kbps
				3/4	900 kbps
		MCS 3-4	16-QAM	1/2	1200 kbps
				3/4	1800 kbps
		MCS 5-7	64-QAM	2/3	2400 kbps
				3/4	2700 kbps
				5/6	3000 kbps
		MCS 8-9	256-QAM	3/4	3600 kbps
				5/6	4000 kbps

TABLE I
PARAMETERS OF THE CHANNEL PROPAGATION AND IEEE 802.11AH PHY MODELS

2) Traffic model: The probability of having a $\psi \in \{\text{DL}, \text{UL}\}$ packet available for transmission in a DTIM interval (p_ψ) depends on the expected generation time between two consecutive packets ($\text{E}[T_{\text{pck}}]$). Since we focus in low traffic load scenarios, we assume in all cases that $T \ll T_{\text{pck}_\psi}$, allowing us to simply compute p_ψ as follows:

$$p_\psi = \min\left(1, \frac{T}{\text{E}[T_{\text{pck}_\psi}]}\right) \quad (2)$$

In those conditions, almost all packet transmissions are completed in the same DTIM interval in which they were generated. Therefore, to keep the presented energy consumption model as simple as possible, we assume that packets unable to be transmitted in the DTIM in which they were generated are discarded. As we will discuss in next Sections, not considering the complex queueing dynamics in the AP and in every STA simplifies the complexity of model without compromising its accuracy and applicability.

III. ENERGY CONSUMPTION MODEL

The energy consumption model proposed in this paper takes as starting point the work of [9], and reformulates it by including the *TIM and page segmentation* elements that characterize the channel access of an IEEE 802.11ah TIM STA.

As shown in Figure 1, within a DTIM period, a STA can perform the following actions:

- Listen to a DTIM beacon
- Listen to a TIM beacon
- Receive a multicast (MC) packet
- Receive a downlink (DL) packet
- Transmit an uplink (UL) packet

To carry out these actions, the IEEE 802.11ah transceiver uses its different operation modes for determined time periods: receiving (t_{RX}), transmitting (t_{TX}), idle (t_{ID}), and sleeping (t_{SL}).

Hence, the energy consumed by an IEEE 802.11ah STA (without considering data processing or sensor operation) is obtained by multiplying the time a transceiver is expected to be in each of its operation modes by the corresponding power consumption of each mode, and is given by:

$$E = P_{\text{RX}} \cdot t_{\text{RX}} + P_{\text{TX}} \cdot t_{\text{TX}} + P_{\text{ID}} \cdot t_{\text{ID}} + P_{\text{SL}} \cdot t_{\text{SL}} \quad (3)$$

In the following, we will calculate the energy spent by a STA during a DTIM period according to the fraction of time it remains in each operation mode. Table II may be used from now on as a reference, since it lists the main parameters considered in the model and their definition.

A. Consumption in the receiving state

The time a STA is in the receiving state is given by (5), where all the $T_{i,j}^{\text{RX}(\psi)}$ durations are computed as follows:

$$T_{i,j}^{\text{RX}(\psi)} = \alpha \cdot T_{\text{DATA}} + \beta \cdot T_{\text{CTS}} + \gamma \cdot T_{\text{ACK}} \quad (4)$$

with the values of α, β, and γ shown in Table III.

The energy consumed in receiving mode, i.e., (5), includes the following situations:

T	Time between two consecutive DTIM beacons
N_{STA}	Number of STAs
N_P	Number of pages $N_P = \lceil \frac{N_{\text{STA}}}{2048} \rceil$
N_{TIM}	Number of TIM groups
r	Station data rate
r_{min}	Minimum network data rate
β_ψ	Proportion of DL/UL traffic
T_{DTIM}	DTIM Beacon time [10] $T_{\text{DTIM}} = \frac{L_{\text{DTIM}}}{r_{\text{min}}} = \frac{25+\left(11+\frac{17}{4}\cdot N_{\text{TIM}}+\frac{256}{N_{\text{TIM}}}\right)\cdot N_P}{r_{\text{min}}}$
T_{TIM}	TIM Beacon time [10] $T_{\text{TIM}} = \frac{L_{\text{TIM}}}{r_{\text{min}}} = \frac{25+\left(10+\frac{256}{N_{\text{TIM}}}\right)\cdot N_P}{r_{\text{min}}}$
T_{RAW_ψ}	RAW time [10] $T_{\text{RAW}_\psi} = \frac{1}{N_{\text{TIM}}} \cdot [(\frac{T}{N_{\text{TIM}} \cdot N_P} - T_{\text{MC}} - T_{\text{DTIM}}) \cdot \beta_\psi] + \frac{N_{\text{TIM}}-1}{N_{\text{TIM}}} \cdot [(\frac{T}{N_{\text{TIM}} \cdot N_P} - T_{\text{TIM}}) \cdot \beta_\psi]$
N_{STA_ψ}	Number of STAs per TIM group $N_{\text{STA}_\psi} = \frac{N_{\text{STA}}}{N_{\text{TIM}}}$
$N^*_{\text{STA}_\psi}$	Number of STAs per TIM group with pending ψ traffic (i.e., contenders) $N^*_{\text{STA}_\psi} = N_{\text{STA}_\psi} \cdot p_\psi$
N_ψ	Maximum number of ψ packets in a DTIM period, as defined in [10]
p_ψ	Probability of a STA having a pending ψ packet
$p^{(\psi)}_{s_{i,j}}$	Probability of a STA having a successful transmission with i collisions and j errors
$p^{(\psi)}_{ns_{i,j}}$	Probability of a STA not having a successful transmission with i collisions and j errors
$p^{(\psi)}_{w_{i,j}}$	Probability of a STA not crossing its corresponding RAW_ψ segment boundary
$T^{\text{op.mode}(\psi)}_{i,j}$	Time consumed in the corresponding operation mode for a ψ transmission with i collisions and j errors
m_{col}	Retransmission limit for an PS_ POLL (DL transmission) or an RTS frame (UL transmission) due to collisions
m_{err}	Retransmission limit for a DATA packet due to errors
t_{slot}	Duration of an IEEE 802.11ah time slot
CW_{min}	Minimum value of contention window
CW_{max}	Maximum value of contention window
T_ψ	Time of a complete ψ transmission $T_{\text{DL}} = \frac{L_{\text{PS\_POLL}}}{r} + T_{\text{SIFS}} + \frac{L_{\text{DATA}}}{r} + T_{\text{SIFS}} + \frac{L_{\text{ACK}}}{r} + T_{\text{DIFS}}$ $T_{\text{UL}} = \frac{L_{\text{RTS}}}{r} + T_{\text{SIFS}} + \frac{L_{\text{CTS}}}{r} + T_{\text{SIFS}} + \frac{L_{\text{DATA}}}{r} + T_{\text{SIFS}} + \frac{L_{\text{ACK}}}{r} + T_{\text{DIFS}}$
T_{c_ψ}	Time spent during a collision $T_{c_{\text{DL}}} = \frac{L_{\text{PS\_POLL}}}{r} + T_{\text{DIFS}}$ $T_{c_{\text{UL}}} = \frac{L_{\text{RTS}}}{r} + T_{\text{DIFS}}$
T_{e_ψ}	Time spent during an error $T_{e_{\text{DL}}} = \frac{L_{\text{PS\_POLL}}}{r} + T_{\text{SIFS}} + \frac{L_{\text{DATA}}}{r} + T_{\text{DIFS}}$ $T_{e_{\text{UL}}} = \frac{L_{\text{RTS}}}{r} + T_{\text{SIFS}} + \frac{L_{\text{CTS}}}{r} + T_{\text{SIFS}} + \frac{L_{\text{DATA}}}{r} + T_{\text{DIFS}}$

TABLE II
MAIN IEEE 802.11AH ENERGY CONSUMPTION MODEL PARAMETERS

$$
\begin{aligned}
t_{\text{RX}} \;=\; & \underbrace{T_{\text{DTIM}}}_{\text{(a)}} + \underbrace{\frac{N_{\text{TIM}}-1}{N_{\text{TIM}}} \cdot (p_{\text{DL}_{\text{TIM}}} \cup p_{\text{UL}}) \cdot T_{\text{TIM}}}_{\text{(b)}} + \underbrace{p_{\text{MC}} \cdot T_{\text{DATA}}}_{\text{(c)}} + \\
& + \underbrace{p_{\text{DL}} \cdot \left(\sum_{i=0}^{m_{\text{col}}-1} \sum_{j=0}^{m_{\text{err}}-1} p^{(\text{DL})}_{s_{i,j}} \cdot T^{\text{RX(DL)}}_{i,j} + \sum_{i=0}^{m_{\text{col}}-1} p^{(\text{DL})}_{ns_{i,m_{\text{err}}}} \cdot T^{\text{RX(DL)}}_{i,m_{\text{err}}} + \sum_{j=0}^{m_{\text{err}}-1} p^{(\text{DL})}_{ns_{m_{\text{col}},j}} \cdot T^{\text{RX(DL)}}_{m_{\text{col}},j} + \sum_{i=0}^{m_{\text{col}}-1} \sum_{j=0}^{m_{\text{err}}-1} \left(1 - p^{(\text{DL})}_{w_{i,j}}\right) \cdot T'^{\text{RX(DL)}}_{i,j} \right)}_{\text{(d)}} + \\
& + \underbrace{p_{\text{UL}} \cdot \left(\sum_{i=0}^{m_{\text{col}}-1} \sum_{j=0}^{m_{\text{err}}-1} p^{(\text{UL})}_{s_{i,j}} \cdot T^{\text{RX(UL)}}_{i,j} + \sum_{i=0}^{m_{\text{col}}-1} p^{(\text{UL})}_{ns_{i,m_{\text{err}}}} \cdot T^{\text{RX(UL)}}_{i,m_{\text{err}}} + \sum_{j=0}^{m_{\text{err}}-1} p^{(\text{UL})}_{ns_{m_{\text{col}},j}} \cdot T^{\text{RX(UL)}}_{m_{\text{col}},j} + \sum_{i=0}^{m_{\text{col}}-1} \sum_{j=0}^{m_{\text{err}}-1} \left(1 - p^{(\text{UL})}_{w_{i,j}}\right) \cdot T'^{\text{RX(UL)}}_{i,j} \right)}_{\text{(e)}}
\end{aligned}
\tag{5}
$$

(a) *DTIM Beacon transmission.* Every DTIM beacon must be listened by all TIM STAs, since they contain all necessary information to send/receive data to/from the AP.

(b) *TIM Beacon transmission.* A STA listens to its corresponding TIM beacon with probability $p_{\text{DL}_{\text{TIM}}} \cup p_{\text{UL}} = p_{\text{DL}_{\text{TIM}}} + p_{\text{UL}} - p_{\text{DL}_{\text{TIM}}} \cdot p_{\text{UL}}$, where $p_{\text{DL}_{\text{TIM}}} = 1 - (1 - p_{\text{DL}})^{N_{\text{STA}_{\text{DL}}}}$ is the probability the AP has announced in the last DTIM beacon that it has downlink traffic addressed to the STA's

	Downlink reception (term d in (5))				Uplink transmission (term e in (5))			
	$T_{i,j}^{\mathrm{RX(DL)}}$	$T_{i,m_{\mathrm{err}}}^{\mathrm{RX(DL)}}$	$T_{m_{\mathrm{col}},j}^{\mathrm{RX(DL)}}$	$T_{i,j}^{\prime\mathrm{RX(DL)}}$	$T_{i,j}^{\mathrm{RX(UL)}}$	$T_{i,m_{\mathrm{err}}}^{\mathrm{RX(UL)}}$	$T_{m_{\mathrm{col}},j}^{\mathrm{RX(UL)}}$	$T_{i,j}^{\prime\mathrm{RX(UL)}}$
α	$j+1$	m_{err}	j	j	0	0	0	0
β	0	0	0	0	$j+1$	m_{err}	j	j
γ	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0

TABLE III
α, β, AND γ VALUES FOR (4)

corresponding TIM group and p_{UL} is the probability the STA has pending data to transmit.

(c) *Multicast transmission.* As observed in the receiving procedure in Figure 1, there is a multicast RAW segment placed immediately after each DTIM beacon. STAs must remain in the receiving state during this segment to receive a multicast packet previously signalled in the DTIM beacon.

(d) *Downlink data packet transmission.* To receive a data packet, a STA remains in the receiving state for a certain time period called $T_{i,j}^{\mathrm{RX(DL)}}$, where i is the number of collisions, j is the number of errors, RX is the operation mode and DL is the traffic flow. More specifically, this time is computed as a combination of four factors: the probability of successfully listening to the corresponding data packet $(p_{s_{i,j}})$ and the probabilities of the packet being dropped due to errors $(p_{ns_{i,m_{\mathrm{err}}}})$, collisions with other contenders $(p_{ns_{m_{\mathrm{col}},j}})$ or having crossed the RAW$_\psi$ boundary $(1-p_{w_{i,j}})$.

(e) *Uplink data packet transmission.* To receive the CTS and the ACK corresponding to a successful transmission, a STA remains in the receiving state for a certain time period called $T_{i,j}^{\mathrm{RX(UL)}}$. Similarly as in the previous case, this time also depends on the ability of accessing the channel, which can be affected by errors, collisions, and the RAW$_\psi$ size.

B. Consumption in the transmitting state

The time a STA is in the transmitting state is given by (7), where all the $T_{i,j}^{\mathrm{TX}(\psi)}$ durations are computed as follows:

$$T_{i,j}^{\mathrm{TX}(\psi)} = \quad \alpha \cdot T_{\mathrm{PS\_POLL}} + \beta \cdot T_{\mathrm{ACK}} + \gamma \cdot T_{\mathrm{RTS}} + \delta \cdot T_{\mathrm{DATA}} \tag{6}$$

with the values of α, β, γ, and δ shown in Table IV.

The energy consumed in transmitting mode, i.e., (7), includes the following situations:

(a) *Downlink reception.* To complete a successful data reception, STAs also have to send a PS-POLL and an ACK frame. The length of the time period in the transmitting state $(T_{i,j}^{\mathrm{TX(DL)}})$ varies as a function of PS-POLL sending success, which depends in turn on transmission errors, collisions and the RAW$_\psi$ size.

(b) *Uplink transmission.* Finally, it must also take into account the time a STA remains in the transmitting state due to the sending of RTS and DATA packets $(T_{i,j}^{\mathrm{TX(UL)}})$. In this case, both transmissions can be affected by errors, although only the sending of the RTS frame can suffer collisions.

C. Consumption in the idle state

The time a STA is in the idle state is given by (9), where all the $T_{i,j}^{\mathrm{ID}(\psi)}$ durations are computed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} T_{i,j}^{\mathrm{ID}(\psi)} \approx\ & \alpha \cdot T_{\mathrm{DIFS}} + \beta \cdot T_{\mathrm{SIFS}} + \\ & + t_{\mathrm{slot}} \cdot \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\gamma} \frac{\min\left\{2^k \cdot (\mathrm{CW_{min}}+1), \mathrm{CW_{max}}+1\right\}}{2} \right) + \\ & + \left(\frac{N_{\mathrm{STA}_\psi}^*}{2} \right) \cdot ((1-p_{c_\psi}) \cdot (1-p_{e_\psi}) \cdot T_\psi + \\ & + p_{c_\psi} \cdot T_{c_\psi} + (1-p_{c_\psi}) \cdot p_{e_\psi} \cdot T_{e_\psi}) \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

with the values of α, β, and γ shown in Table V.

The energy consumed in idle mode, i.e., (9), includes the following situations:

(a) *Multicast reception.* After receiving a multicast packet, all STAs go to sleep except those from the first TIM group to which the AP has pending data to send, staying in the idle state for the duration of the subsequent DIFS period.

(b) *Downlink reception.* Time in the idle state $(T_{i,j}^{\mathrm{ID(DL)}})$ is modelled as an addition of DIFS, SIFS, backoff and waiting periods due to the data reception procedure of other TIM group contenders. In the model it is assumed that, on average, any STA transmits after the channel has been occupied by $\frac{N_{\mathrm{STA}_\psi}^*}{2}$ contenders, which in turn can have experienced collisions or errors. The effect of the time-limited RAW$_\psi$ segment is also considered.

(c) *Uplink transmission.* Similarly, time in the idle state $(T_{i,j}^{\mathrm{ID(UL)}})$ is computed as an addition of DIFS, SIFS, backoff and waiting periods due to the data transmission procedure of other $\frac{N_{STA_\psi}^*}{2}$ contenders.

D. Successful transmission probability

A common element in the previous equations is the successful transmission probability of a STA after i collisions and j errors without crossing its corresponding RAW$_\psi$ segment boundary. It is noted as $p_{s_{i,j}}^{(\psi)}$ and defined by (10):

$$\begin{aligned} & p_{s_{i,j}}^{(\psi)} = \\ & \binom{i+j}{i} \cdot p_{c_\psi}^i \cdot p_{e_\psi}^j \cdot \left(1-p_{c_\psi}\right)^{j+1} \cdot \left(1-p_{e_\psi}\right) \cdot p_{w_{i,j}}^{(\psi)} \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

where $p_{w_{i,j}}^{(\psi)}$ is computed as in (12).

Similarly, the probability (11) of a STA not having a successful transmission after i collisions and j errors without crossing its corresponding RAW$_\psi$ segment boundary is:

$$t_{\text{TX}} = \underbrace{p_{\text{DL}} \cdot \left(\sum_{i=0}^{m_{\text{col}}-1} \sum_{j=0}^{m_{\text{err}}-1} p_{s_{i,j}}^{(\text{DL})} \cdot T_{i,j}^{\text{TX(DL)}} + \sum_{i=0}^{m_{\text{col}}-1} p_{ns_{i,m_{\text{err}}}}^{(\text{DL})} \cdot T_{i,m_{\text{err}}}^{\text{TX(DL)}} + \sum_{j=0}^{m_{\text{err}}-1} p_{ns_{m_{\text{col}},j}}^{(\text{DL})} \cdot T_{m_{\text{col}},j}^{\text{TX(DL)}} + \sum_{i=0}^{m_{\text{col}}-1} \sum_{j=0}^{m_{\text{err}}-1} \left(1 - p_{w_{i,j}}^{(\text{DL})}\right) \cdot T_{i,j}^{\prime\text{TX(DL)}} \right)}_{\text{(a)}} +$$

$$+ \underbrace{p_{\text{UL}} \cdot \left(\sum_{i=0}^{m_{\text{col}}-1} \sum_{j=0}^{m_{\text{err}}-1} p_{s_{i,j}}^{(\text{UL})} \cdot T_{i,j}^{\text{TX(UL)}} + \sum_{i=0}^{m_{\text{col}}-1} p_{ns_{i,m_{\text{err}}}}^{(\text{UL})} \cdot T_{i,m_{\text{err}}}^{\text{TX(UL)}} + \sum_{j=0}^{m_{\text{err}}-1} p_{ns_{m_{\text{col}},j}}^{(\text{UL})} \cdot T_{m_{\text{col}},j}^{\text{TX(UL)}} + \sum_{i=0}^{m_{\text{col}}-1} \sum_{j=0}^{m_{\text{err}}-1} \left(1 - p_{w_{i,j}}^{(\text{DL})}\right) \cdot T_{i,j}^{\prime\text{TX(UL)}} \right)}_{\text{(b)}} \quad (7)$$

	Downlink reception (a)				Uplink transmission (b)			
	$T_{i,j}^{\text{TX(DL)}}$	$T_{i,m_{\text{err}}}^{\text{TX(DL)}}$	$T_{m_{\text{col}},j}^{\text{TX(DL)}}$	$T_{i,j}^{\prime\text{TX(DL)}}$	$T_{i,j}^{\text{TX(UL)}}$	$T_{i,m_{\text{err}}}^{\text{TX(UL)}}$	$T_{m_{\text{col}},j}^{\text{TX(UL)}}$	$T_{i,j}^{\prime\text{TX(UL)}}$
α	$i+j+1$	$i+m_{\text{err}}$	$m_{\text{col}+j}$	$i+j$	0	0	0	0
β	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
γ	0	0	0	0	$i+j+1$	$i+m_{\text{err}}$	$m_{\text{col}+j}$	$i+j$
δ	0	0	0	0	$j+1$	m_{err}	j	j

TABLE IV
α, β, γ, AND δ VALUES FOR (6)

$$t_{\text{ID}} \approx \underbrace{p_{\text{MC}} \cdot T_{\text{DIFS}}}_{\text{(a)}} + \quad (9)$$

$$+ \underbrace{p_{\text{DL}} \cdot \left(\sum_{i=0}^{m_{\text{col}}-1} \sum_{j=0}^{m_{\text{err}}-1} p_{s_{i,j}}^{(\text{DL})} \cdot T_{i,j}^{\text{ID(DL)}} + \sum_{i=0}^{m_{\text{col}}-1} p_{ns_{i,m_{\text{err}}}}^{(DL)} \cdot T_{i,m_{\text{err}}}^{\text{ID(DL)}} + \sum_{j=0}^{m_{\text{err}}-1} p_{ns_{m_{\text{col}},j}}^{(\text{DL})} \cdot T_{m_{\text{col}},j}^{\text{ID(DL)}} + \sum_{i=0}^{m_{\text{col}}-1} \sum_{j=0}^{m_{\text{err}}-1} \left(1 - p_{w_{i,j}}^{(\text{DL})}\right) \cdot T_{i,j}^{\prime\text{ID(DL)}} \right)}_{\text{(b)}} +$$

$$+ \underbrace{p_{\text{UL}} \cdot \left(\sum_{i=0}^{m_{\text{col}}-1} \sum_{j=0}^{m_{\text{err}}-1} p_{s_{i,j}}^{(\text{UL})} \cdot T_{i,j}^{\text{ID(UL)}} + \sum_{i=0}^{m_{\text{col}}-1} p_{ns_{i,m_{\text{err}}}}^{(\text{UL})} \cdot T_{i,m_{err}}^{\text{ID(UL)}} + \sum_{j=0}^{m_{\text{err}}-1} p_{ns_{m_{\text{col}},j}}^{(\text{UL})} \cdot T_{m_{\text{col}},j}^{\text{ID(UL)}} + \sum_{i=0}^{m_{\text{col}}-1} \sum_{j=0}^{m_{\text{err}}-1} \left(1 - p_{w_{i,j}}^{(\text{UL})}\right) \cdot T_{i,j}^{\prime\text{ID(UL)}} \right)}_{\text{(c)}}$$

	Downlink reception (b)				Uplink transmission (c)			
	$T_{i,j}^{\text{ID(DL)}}$	$T_{i,m_{\text{err}}}^{\text{ID(DL)}}$	$T_{m_{\text{col}},j}^{\text{ID(DL)}}$	$T_{i,j}^{\prime\text{ID(DL)}}$	$T_{i,j}^{\text{ID(UL)}}$	$T_{i,m_{\text{err}}}^{\text{ID(UL)}}$	$T_{m_{\text{col}},j}^{\text{ID(UL)}}$	$T_{i,j}^{\prime\text{ID(UL)}}$
α	$i+j+1$	$i+m_{\text{err}}$	$m_{\text{col}}+j$	$i+j$	$i+j+1$	$i+m_{\text{err}}$	$m_{\text{col}}+j$	$i+j$
β	$j+2$	m_{err}	j	j	$2j+3$	$2m_{\text{err}}$	$2j$	$2j$
γ	$i+j$	$i+m_{\text{err}}-1$	$m_{\text{col}}+j-1$	$i+j$	$i+j$	$i+m_{\text{err}}-1$	$m_{\text{col}}+j-1$	$i+j$

TABLE V
α, β, AND γ VALUES FOR (8)

$$p_{ns_{i,j}}^{(\psi)} = \binom{i+j}{i} \cdot p_{c_\psi}^i \cdot p_{e_\psi}^j \cdot \left(1 - p_{c_\psi}\right)^j \cdot p_{w_{i,j}}^{(\psi)} \quad (11)$$

The function which models the RAW$_\psi$ boundary crossing ($p_{w_{i,j}}^{(\psi)}$) compares the channel occupation time of contender stations with the size of the current RAW$_\psi$ segment and is defined as:

The collision probability (13) of a PS_POLL frame in a DL transmission procedure or of a RTS frame in an UL transmision procedure within a determined TIM period containing $N_{\text{STA}_\psi}^*$ active STAs is given by:

$$p_{c_\psi} \approx 1 - \left(1 - p_\psi \cdot \frac{1}{\text{CW}_{\text{min}}}\right)^{N_{\text{STA}_\psi}-1} \quad (13)$$

where we have assumed that $N_{\text{STA}_\psi} \geqslant 1$ in the observed TIM group.

E. Consumption in the sleeping state

Finally, a STA remains asleep when not being in any other state as computed as follows:

$$t_{\text{SL}} = T - t_{\text{RX}} - t_{\text{TX}} - t_{\text{ID}} \quad (14)$$

IV. MODEL EVALUATION

This section provides a comparative analysis between the proposed IEEE 802.11ah energy consumption analytical model and the results obtained from simulating a fully connected IEEE 802.11ah WLAN in MATLAB. The simulator accurately reproduces the system model introduced in Section II. However, differently from the model, the simulator accumulates in a buffer all those packets not transmitted in the TIM period in which they have been generated, giving the opportunity to be sent in other TIM periods. Hence, comparing the simulation results with the ones obtained from the model will allow us to quantify the impact of such assumption. Moreover, the results presented in this section will be helpful to evaluate the

$$p_{w_{i,j}}^{(\psi)} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \frac{N^*_{\text{STA}_\psi}}{2} \cdot \left((1-p_{c_\psi})\cdot(1-p_{e_\psi})\cdot T_\psi + p_{c_\psi}\cdot T_{c_\psi} + (1-p_{c_\psi})\cdot p_{e_\psi}\cdot T_{e_\psi}\right) + i\cdot T_{c_\psi} + j\cdot T_{e_\psi} + T_\psi \leq T_{\text{RAW}_\psi} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

$t_{\text{simulation}}$	T = 1.6 s
N_{TIM}	8
T_{SIFS}	160 μs
T_{DIFS}	264 μs
t_{slot}	52 μs
CW_{min}	16
CW_{max}	1024
m_{col}	7
m_{err}	1
L_{DATA}	100 bytes
$L_{\text{PS\_POLL}}$	14 bytes
L_{ACK}	14 bytes
L_{RTS}	20 bytes
L_{CTS}	14 bytes
$p_{e_{\text{DL}}}$	0
$p_{e_{\text{UL}}}$	0.1

TABLE VI
MAIN SIMULATION PARAMETERS FOR IEEE 802.11AH MAC LAYER



Fig. 3. Percentage of consumption in each state for different packet generation rates in an indoor scenario *(solid line:* $p_{DL} = 0.25, p_{UL} = 0.25$*, dashed line:* $p_{DL} = 0.15, p_{UL} = 0.15$*, dashdotted line:* $p_{DL} = 0.05, p_{UL} = 0.05$*)*

performance of the *TIM and page segmentation mechanism* included in the IEEE 802.11ah amendment.

A. Comparison of different traffic patterns

First simulation results show the percentage of time that an IEEE 802.11ah transceiver remains in each of its possible states (receiving, transmitting, idle, and sleeping) for three different traffic patterns: $p_{\text{DL}} = p_{\text{UL}} = \{25\%, 15\%, 5\%\}$; and two scenarios: a $100m\ x\ 100m$ indoor network (Figure 3) and a $1000m\ x\ 1000m$ outdoor network (Figure 4), based on the models presented in subsection II-B.

One can observe that analytical results in both scenarios are similar to those obtained by simulation. Moreover, it is worth noting that the highest similarity is achieved for low traffic loads. It should be taken into account that, unlike the model, the simulator has a buffer that allows to each STA to retransmit those packets not properly transmitted at their corresponding TIM period. When the traffic load increases, the network



Fig. 4. Percentage of consumption in each state for different packet generation rates in an outdoor scenario *(solid line:* $p_{DL} = 0.25, p_{UL} = 0.25$*, dashed line:* $p_{DL} = 0.15, p_{UL} = 0.15$*, dashdotted line:* $p_{DL} = 0.05, p_{UL} = 0.05$*)*

behaviour slightly differs from the simulator. The higher the generated traffic, the higher the number of STAs competing and, consequently, the higher the number of collisions.

When the traffic load increases, differences between the model results and the simulations also do. This difference is mainly caused by the increase of the collision probability, affected by the higher number of STAs competing for the channel. As the simulator has a buffer storing all those non-transmitted packets, the number of active STAs competing for the channel at the next DTIM period will be higher. The higher the collisions, the lower the energy consumed at the transmitting state. For that reason the simulator reduces its transmitting consumption, compared to the results achieved by the model.

Furthermore, the results show that, on average, a STA remains more than 95% of time in the sleeping state. This fact shows that the IEEE 802.11ah power saving mechanisms allow to reduce the energy consumption by giving the opportunity to the STAs of remaining in a low power state the majority of the operating time.

B. Results from four different application scenarios

In order to validate the model accuracy in different representative IoT scenarios, we have considered the four use cases (agricultural monitoring, smart metering, industrial automation and animal monitoring) presented in [11] and summarized at Table VII.

The results shown in Figure 5 reflect a good accuracy between the model and the simulator in terms of mean current consumed by a STA. If we compare the current consumed, the highest difference (lower than 0.02 mA) appears in the agricultural scenario. As this scenario has the highest number of stations, the number of packets to transmit is also the highest. In that sense, the high collision probability boost the

	Agricultural monitoring	Smart metering	Industrial automation	Animal monitoring
N_{STA}	3500	15	500	250
$E[T_{packet}]_{DL}$	240s	240s	240s	240s
P_{DL}	0.67%	0.67%	0.67%	0.67%
$E[T_{packet}]_{UL}$	120s	50s	180s	60s
P_{UL}	1.33%	3.2%	0.89%	2.67%
Area	1000x1000m	8x10m	250x250m	1000x1000m
Propagation model	outdoor	indoor	indoor	outdoor

TABLE VII
MAIN SIMULATION PARAMETERS FOR FOUR APPLICATIONS SCENARIOS



Fig. 5. Percentage of consumption in each state for the agriculture monitoring scenario.

chances of a packet not being transmitted in its corresponding TIM period. Since this situation is not contemplated in our model, the number of packets transmitted in the simulator are higher, which justifies the slight optimism of our model. Moreover, as in the previous results, a STA remains more than 99% of time at the sleeping state.

By means of using the proposed model, it is possible to predict the energy that a network will consume and even estimate its overall battery lifetime (B_{LT}):

$$B_{\mathrm{LT}} = \frac{C}{\frac{t_{\mathrm{RX}} I_{\mathrm{RX}} + t_{\mathrm{TX}} I_{\mathrm{TX}} + t_{\mathrm{ID}} I_{\mathrm{ID}} + t_{\mathrm{SL}} I_{\mathrm{SL}}}{T}} \tag{15}$$

where C is the capacity of the battery in mAh, t_ρ and I_ρ are respectively the time spent and the current consumption at each transceiver state, and $\rho = \{\mathrm{RX}, \mathrm{TX}, \mathrm{ID}, \mathrm{SL}\}$ the four different states.

In Figure 6 we compare the battery lifetime obtained from the simulator and the model. Both values are comparable, although our model is again a little bit more optimistic than the simulator. The major difference obtained is, approximately, 12% at the agricultural monitoring scenario, which is the one with the largest number of STAs and traffic load. In order to reduce this possible optimism of our model, one could multiply the results of battery estimation by a factor, e.g. 0.8, in order to reduce this.



Fig. 6. Battery lifetime.



Fig. 7. Current consumed vs. number of TIM groups (N_{TIM})

V. OPTIMIZATION

In this section, a performance optimization is done in order to derive the best parameter configuration of an IEEE 802.11ah WLAN for the four representative M2M scenarios introduced before, which cover a wide range of use cases for IEEE 802.11ah WLANs.

The two main parameters that define the channel access in an IEEE 802.11ah network are the number of TIM groups in which stations are distributed (N_{TIM}) and the time between two consecutive DTIM beacons (T). Thus, we have evaluated different values of both parameters in order to find the configuration that minimizes the total energy consumption without affecting the probability of successfully transmitting a packet, which must be of 100 % in all cases.

A. N_{TIM} optimization

We can observe in Figure 7 that, in terms of current consumed, $N_{\mathrm{TIM}} = 8$ is the optimal value for an IEEE 802.11ah STA. Although increasing the number of TIM groups reduces collisions, the current consumption over the optimal N_{TIM} value is noticeably affected by the higher size of beacons.

It is worth noting here that the energy consumption is inversely proportional to the time between DTIM beacons (T). This is due to the fact that the number of correctly transmitted packets becomes also lower. However, when T is increased, the time between two transmission opportunities also does (a STA can only transmit in its own TIM period), which is a limiting factor in time-critical applications.



Fig. 8. Percentage of packets succesfully transmitted vs. time between two consecutive DTIM beacons (T seconds)


Mean current consumed (mA)
Scenario:
1: Agricultural monitoring 2: Smart metering 3: Industrial automation 4: Animal monitoring
Battery lifetime (years)
Agricultural monitoring
Smart metering
Industrial automation
Animal monitoring
Battery:
1: 2xAA batteries (1500 mAh) 2: Lthium battery (2500 mAh) 3: 2xAAA batteries (7500 mAh)

Fig. 9. Comparison of the model with non-optimized parameters and optimized

B. T optimization

In Figure 8 we plot the probability of successfully sending a packet when setting $N_{\text{TIM}} = 8$ for different values of T. This probability diminishes when the time between DTIM periods increases, even if the TIM duration is proportionally extended. As stated in (2), the traffic is generated fixing the time between two consecutive packets. Hence, the higher the value of T, the more STAs with pending traffic in each DTIM period.

To summarize, and taken into account what we have observed in previous results, the T optimal value will be the highest one which ensures the highest probability of successful transmissions. In this occasion, the results reflect that this optimal value highly depends on the scenario analysed: $T = 2.4s$ for agricultural monitoring, $T = 45.1s$ for smart metering, $T = 13.1s$ for industrial automation, and $T = 8.1s$ for animal monitoring. One can observe that the $T = 1.6s$ value proposed by the standard can be further increased in many scenarios, if we want to reduce the energy consumption without affecting the probability of successful packet transmission.

C. Effects of the optimization

For each scenario, we compare the mean current consumption and the battery lifetime achieved when using the optimal T and N_{TIM} values with the predefined ones ($T = 1.6s$ and $N_{\text{TIM}} = 8$). The results obtained are shown in Figure 9. The current consumption and the battery lifetime with optimized parameters outperform the performance of the predefined ones. By way of example, current consumption reduction in the animal monitoring scenario is roughly half of the energy consumed with the predefined values.

Depending on the application scenario, the predefined IEEE 802.11ah values of T and N_{TIM} can be tuned in order to improve the general network performance. Thus, apart from providing a good estimation of the energy consumption in a wide range of scenarios, the model proposed in the current work is an efficient tool to obtain these optimized parameters.

VI. Conclusions

It is a well-known fact that energy consumption represents one of the most striking challenges in the design and exploitation of WSNs. The study and characterization of this behaviour according to different network conditions such as traffic load or number of stations, as well as other intrinsic network parameters, becomes therefore an essential step previous to further research in energy-saving mechanisms.

In this work, an analytical model to understand the energy consumption of an IEEE 802.11ah station has been proposed. Its accuracy has been proved by comparing it with simulation results from four representative M2M scenarios. In all of them the model has been an excellent tool to estimate their battery lifetime.

The effect of varying different network configuration parameters on the whole system has been analysed, showing that the model is able to determine the best values to minimize the current consumption or maximize the success of sending a packet in each scenario. In this regard, increasing the time between DTIM beacons always offers better results in terms of energy consumption. However, it is necessary to take into consideration the trade-off between energy and probability of success when selecting the optimum value. As for the optimization of the number of TIM groups, it has been proven that $N_{\text{TIM}} = 8$ minimizes the overall consumed energy. In terms of T, its optimized value will highly depend on the scenario. As expected, the higher the traffic generation rate and the number of nodes, the lower the optimal value of T.

The current model may be extended in order to include some of the latest IEEE 802.11ah MAC features intended to support energy-efficient communications for sensors. Among them, [16] outlines the most notable ones: *Bidirectional TXOP* lets exchange one or more UL and DL packets in a transmission opportunity (TXOP) duration, *NDP CMAC (Null Data Packet Carrying MAC)* reduces overhead of control frames, and *Short MAC Frame* does the same with MAC headers.

Lastly, this model opens the door to further research in the design of advanced sleeping mechanisms which will help to enlarge the battery lifetime of sensor nodes while ensuring proper network operation.

Acknowledgments

This work was partially supported by the Spanish and Catalan governments through the projects TEC2012-32354 and SGR-2014-1173, respectively. It has also been funded by the ENTOMATIC FP7-SME-2013 EC project (605073).

REFERENCES

[1] Machina Research, "The need for low cost, high reach, wide area connectivity for the Internet of Things," http://www.neul.com/neul/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/Neul_Machina_Research_White_Paper.pdf, 2014, accessed: 2015-11-20.

[2] B. Bellalta, L. Bononi, R. Bruno, and A. Kassler, "Next generation ieee 802.11 wireless local area networks: Current status, future directions and open challenges," *Computer Communications*, 2015.

[3] S. Aust, R. V. Prasad, and I. G. Niemegeers, "IEEE 802.11ah: Advantages in Standards and Further Challenges for Sub 1 GHz Wi-Fi," in *Proceedings of IEEE International Conference on Communications, ICC 2012*, 2012, pp. 6885–6889.

[4] E. Khorov, A. Lyakhov, A. Krotov, and A. Guschin, "A survey on IEEE 802.11 ah: An enabling networking technology for smart cities," *Computer Communications*, vol. 58, pp. 53–69, 2015.

[5] C. G. et al, "TIM and Page Segmentation," https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/12/11-12-1084-04-00ah-tim-and-page-segmentation.ppt.

[6] "IEEE Standard for Information technology–Telecommunications and information exchange between systems Local and metropolitan area networks–Specific requirements Part 11: Wireless LAN Medium Access Control (MAC) and Physical Layer (PHY) Specifications," *IEEE Std 802.11-2012 (Revision of IEEE Std 802.11-2007)*, pp. 1–2793, 2012.

[7] L. Zheng, L. Cai, J. Pan, and M. Ni, "Performance analysis of grouping strategy for dense IEEE 802.11 networks," in *Global Communications Conference (GLOBECOM), 2013 IEEE*, Dec 2013, pp. 219–224.

[8] R. P. Liu, G. Sutton, and I. Collings, "Power save with Offset Listen Interval for IEEE 802.11ah Smart Grid communications," in *Communications (ICC), 2013 IEEE International Conference on*, June 2013, pp. 4488–4492.

[9] O. Raeesi, J. Pirskanen, A. Hazmi, T. Levanen, and M. Valkama, "Performance evaluation of IEEE 802.11ah and its restricted access window mechanism," in *Communications Workshops (ICC), 2014 IEEE International Conference on*, June 2014, pp. 460–466.

[10] T. Adame, A. Bel, B. Bellalta, J. Barcel, J. Gonzalez, and M. Oliver, "Capacity Analysis of IEEE 802.11ah WLANs for M2M Communications." in *MACOM*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 8310. Springer, 2013, pp. 139–155. [Online]. Available: http://dblp.uni-trier.de/db/conf/macom/macom2013.html

[11] T. Adame, A. Bel, B. Bellalta, J. Barcelo, and M. Oliver, "IEEE 802.11AH: the WiFi approach for M2M communications," *Wireless Communications, IEEE*, vol. 21, no. 6, pp. 144–152, December 2014.

[12] A. Bel, T. Adame, B. Bellalta, J. Barcelo, J. Gonzalez, and M. Oliver, "CAS-based channel access protocol for IEEE 802.11ah WLANs," European Wireless 2014; 20th European Wireless Conference; Proceedings of, May 2014.

[13] M. P. et al, "Uplink channel access," https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/12/11-12-0606-01-00ah-uplink-channel-access.pptx.

[14] G. G. et al, "Sectorization for hidden node mitigation," https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/12/11-12-0852-00-00ah-sectorization-for-hidden-node-mitigation.pptx.

[15] A. Hazmi, J. Rinne, and M. Valkama, "Feasibility Study of IEEE 802.11ah Radio Technology for IoT and M2M Use Cases," in *Globecom Workshops (GC Wkshps), IEEE*, 2012, pp. 1687–1692.

[16] M. Park, "IEEE 802.11 ah: sub-1-GHz license-exempt operation for the internet of things," *Communications Magazine, IEEE*, vol. 53, no. 9, pp. 145–151, 2015.